

the evidence showed conclusively the responsibility of the Greek Government. It was held that many of the witnesses who gave evidence against the northern neighbours were criminals, drunkards, or forced witnesses, an allegation that was not denied on all counts by the members of the Commission, and that the members of the Commission had not been impartial, an allegation that was strongly denied by all but the Slav group. It was charged that the Greek Government was not a legal Government on the grounds that it had been supported against the Greek "democrats" by British troops, and subsequently by American technical and economic aid; that it was infested with former Fascist collaborators; and that it had inaugurated terror and repression, which had forced many thousands of Greek citizens to seek refuge across the borders. The *Albanian* representative, who subscribed to all these arguments, went further by charging Greece with aggressive intentions against his Government. The entire Slav group also argued that the presence of a United Nations Commission on the borders of Greece would be a humiliating and unjustifiable infringement of the national sovereignty of the States concerned. The only point of agreement was that a threatening situation did exist on the northern borders of Greece.

It became apparent as the debate progressed that many delegations, while not disputing the conclusions of the Commission of Investigation, nevertheless doubted the advantage of writing a so-called "guilt clause" into a resolution which contained also a plea for co-operation on the part of Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria. Certain others, however, in view of the fact that the three countries had already refused to co-operate with the subsidiary group and showed every indication of taking a similar stand with regard to any future United Nations body, felt that a guilt clause was fully justified.

Speaking for the *New Zealand* delegation, Sir Carl Berendsen, while not taking a definite stand on this particular point, emphasized the necessity for immediate action in view of the general agreement that a potential threat to the peace did exist. As the Security Council had, by reason of the veto, been unable to act, it was the obvious duty of the Assembly to do so. It was, he said, clearly not possible for either the First Committee or the Assembly to consider the matter at first hand, and it seemed essential, therefore, for a subsidiary body to be established to replace that constituted by the Security Council.

A strictly neutral attitude was expressed in a *Swedish* resolution calling on the Governments concerned to re-establish normal relations and requesting the Secretary-General to set up a committee to